

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/000,209 11/02/2001 Hiroshi Hoshino 6737-01 9139 12/07/2004 **EXAMINER** McCormick, Paulding & Huber BECKER, DREW E City Place II 185 Asylum Street ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Hartford, CT 06103-3402 1761

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/000,209	HOSHINO, HIROSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Drew E Becker	1761
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 October 2004</u> .		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Compared to the process of the process	Paper No(s)/Mail Dat	e´. tent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/000,209

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prohaska [Pat. No. 2,953,461] in view of Neumann [Pat. No. 3,116,680]. Prohaska teaches a method of making sausage by preheating previously ground meat by joule heating (Figure 1, #22), inherently enhancing viscosity, forming the ground meat into shape (Figure 1, #20), a main heating step (column 3, line 21), and preheating at about 140°F (column 3, line 49). Prohaska does not recite joule heating in the main heating step and a temperature of at least 75°C. Neumann teaches a method of making sausage by fully cooking the sausage at 175°F via joule heating (column 4, lines 3-33; column 5, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the joule final heating of Neumann into the invention of Prohaska since both are directed to sausage making methods, since Prohaska already included a final cooking step (column 3, line 21), and since Neumann teaches that sausage were commonly cooked via joule heating (column 4, lines 3-33).
- 3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prohaska, in view of Neumann, as applied above, and further in view of JP 361058533A and JP 408214785A.

Art Unit: 1761

Prohaska and Neumann teach the above mentioned concepts. Prohaska and Neumann do not recite removing fat by soaking in water, or adding salt and seasonings. JP 361058533A teaches a method of making meat products by removing fat by soaking it in water (abstract). JP 408214785A teaches a method of making sausage by adding salt and seasonings (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fat removal of JP 361058533A into the invention of Prohaska, in view of Neumann, since all are directed to methods of making meat products, since sausage was often made from mutton, and since consumers preferred low-fat foods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the salt and seasonings of JP 408214785A into the invention of Prohaska, in view of Neumann, since all are directed to methods of making meat products, since Neumann already included seasonings (column 4, line 6), and since salt and seasonings were commonly used in sausage as shown by JP 408214785A.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Prohaska does not teach a forming step and main heating step. However, Prohaska specifically discloses a forming the product into a sausage shape (Figure 1, #20) as well as a final cooking step (column 3, line 21).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

Application/Control Number: 10/000,209

Art Unit: 1761

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references.

Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/000,209

Art Unit: 1761

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DREW BECKER
RIMARY EXAMINER

12:6-04